

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 remain in this application. Claim 1 is currently being amended and claims 2-5 have been added. No new matter has been added by way of the amendment to claim 1 or the addition of claims 2-5. Reconsideration of all claims is respectfully requested in view of the remarks hereinbelow.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner states that “claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections”. The 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph rejection of amended claim 1 is traversed. Amended claim 1 contains structural cooperative relationships of elements sufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection. Applicant respectfully requests that the 25 U.S.C. §112 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Puetz et al. Puetz discloses numerous embodiments for an optical fiber distribution frame having connector modules (abstract). While Puetz discloses connectors 142, a main panel 124 and a frame 20, the reference fails to teach numerous elements of claim 1.

For example, amended claim 1 recites “a first connector panel having a first stepped face comprising a plurality of steps” with “each of the plurality of first steps oriented in a first direction” and “a second connector panel having a second stepped face comprising a plurality of steps” with “each of the plurality of second steps having an essentially planar surface capable of receiving the second adapter”. Puetz fails to disclose a main panel having a first and second stepped face.

Furthermore, Puetz also fails to disclose a “a base essentially planar in shape and releasably attached to the first and second connector panels, the base further having a handle integral therewith for facilitating removal of the module” (claim 1). The base of

Puetz, as disclosed in at least figures. 1, 4, 9, 17, 21, 30, 32, 43, 50, 53 and 56, does not contain a handle incorporated therein for facilitating removal of the system. For at least this reason, Puetz does not anticipate the base recited in amended claim 1.

Puetz also fails to disclose "a second splice platform located proximate to the first splice platform and releasably mounted to at least one of the base, the multiplexing clamp, the first splice platform, or the cover". And therefore, Puetz cannot anticipate this element of amended claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed hereinabove, Puetz does not anticipate every element of amended claim 1. As such, Puetz cannot form the basis of a valid 35 U.S.C §102(e) rejection of claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn and that the claim be allowed. Applicant further requests allowance of dependent claims 2-5 since Puetz also fails to teach elements contained therein.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone call would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (508) 416-2474.

Respectfully submitted,
BOWDITCH & DEWEY, LLP

By Monica Grewal
Monica Grewal
Date: January 23rd, 2004
Registration No.: 40,056
Direct tel.: (508) 416-2474
Telephone: (508) 879-5700
Facsimile: (508) 929-3073

Bowditch & Dewey, LLP
161 Worcester Road
P.O. Box 9320
Framingham, Massachusetts 01701-9320